UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/542,243	04/03/2000	Arthur W. Wang	PD-990212	4723

7590 10/14/2004

Hughes Electronics Corporation
Corporate Patents & Licensing
Bldg R11 Mail Station A109
P O Box 956
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, CHI Q	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3635	

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/542,243	WANG, ARTHUR W.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chi Q Nguyen	3635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *03* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *4/23/04*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *18-22,24-38 and 40-84* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *18-22,24-38 and 40-84* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *03 April 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the applicant's amendment 4/23/04.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/30/04 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Times of London Article (TL) in view of Oliver (US 6,166,329) and further in view of McDonald (US 6,335,753) and DeMarre (US 6,037,912).

In regard to claims 21, and 18-20, TL teaches structures pre-wired to run a network of computers, satellite, and digital TV and CCTV (see attachment in paragraph 2). The Article does not teach specifically the satellite wires positioned adjacent to the plurality of studs and coupled to drywall layer and having first, second terminations, a

low-profile radome enclosing the first termination, a connector coupled to the second termination. Oliver discloses a building pre-wired for electrical outlets including a plurality of studs 40, electrical wires 18 adjacent to studs 40, connector 10, a drywall 42 encloses from therein (figs. 3A, 3B). McDonald discloses building wired for satellite 22 communication including wires (18,30) that connect the roof mounted antennae on the roof to outlets 18', 30' in the wall thus providing terminations for the wire outside the building, where wire terminating to the connectors (TV, computer, etc.). Outlets tend to be standardized for use such as electrical or phone. Fig. 3 of McDonald shows a standardized phone jack (32). This is considered to be a "universal connector". And DeMarre teaches a profile bi-directional antenna comprises antenna 100, a low-profile radome 104, a satellite wire 113 terminating to a connector 112 (first terminator) of the antenna 100, which enclosing by the radome 104 (see figs. 1-2). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the TL with Oliver's for the plurality of studs and drywall adjacent to pre-wiring and with McDonald for satellite antenna connections and with DeMarre for antenna enclosing by the radome 104. The applicant is merely combining well-known features in the art and using them in their intended manner. For example, Oliver discloses a very conventional stud-wall construction with pre-wired outlets. The TL article discloses that pre-wiring a house for all manner of known electric communication devices per se is known. The TL article did not get into specific structural details. However, it would have been obvious to a home contractor to run those wires in the same manner as Oliver's wiring. DeMarre does not teach specifically the low-profile radome enclosed the antenna and also the

first termination, examiner considers this would have been obvious matter of rearranging parts of invention that involves only routine skill in the art. The motivation for doing so would have been to protect the connection from UV radiation or water damage.

In regard to claims 19-20, combining different function jacks into one connector plate is wall known in the wiring and would be obvious for the TL and Oliver's structures as modified by McDonald. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide users able to connect into different sources such as telephone lines, TVs, internet services, etc. at the same connector without a need of routing wires to another terminal.

Claims 22, 25, 27, 29-38, 41-43, 57-65, 67-72, 75-80, and 82-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over TL in view of Oliver '329 and further in view of McDonald '753 and DeMarre '912.

The TL, Oliver, McDonald disclose the structural elements for the having today homes with latest technology for satellite cable ready except for a radome enclosing a flat satellite and positioned within low-profile sized, color match a roof radome. DeMarre teaches a low profile bi-directional antenna comprises antenna 100, a radome 104, a satellite wire 113, terminating to a connector 112 (first terminator) of the antenna 100, which enclosing by the low-profile radome 104. And the other end of the satellite wire 113 is inherently terminating to other connector (second terminator); the antenna 100 is mounted to a planar surface or the exterior surface of a building (col. 3, line 36-54, col. 6, line 21-42). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine TL, Oliver's, McDonald's with DeMarre teaching for low profile bi-directional antenna enclosing within the radome. The suggestion for doing

would have been to provide satellite wire ready and conveniently for home and office uses, protecting the antenna from UV light and to match the roof color for cosmetically purpose, so as to blend the antenna into the roof. With regard to claims 29-37, 41-43, and 57-64, TL, Oliver, McDonald, and DeMarre teach the structural elements for the satellite cable ready as stated except for the satellite wires having a third, a fourth terminations, a second connector coupled to the fourth termination, a second radome enclosing the third termination. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have more than one radomes and satellite wires connecting to more than one terminations, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working device involves only routine in the art. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide every building unit capable to access satellite signals.

With regard to claim 34, the universal connector comprises a LAN (Local Area Network) jack; examiner considers McDonald or DeMarre inherently teaches this because most of satellite wires are connecting to TV service and Internet service as so-called as network.

Claims 24, 40, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over TL in view of Oliver '329 and further in view of McDonald '753 and DeMarre '912 and Radov '778.

The TL, Oliver, McDonald, and DeMarre teach the structural elements for pre-wiring satellite cable ready for units of building as stated except for the radome have a color to substantially match a surface color of the roof. Radov teaches satellite earth

station comprises a satellite 11, a house roof 12, antenna 16 enclosing by a canopy or radome 40. The canopy or radome is made by strong lightweight plastic capable of transmitting high frequency microwave signals with a minimum of interference. While the plastic is preferable clear, it may be opaque and of a color to match the color of the roof 12 (col. 4, lines 21-250. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the TL, Oliver, McDonald, and DeMare with Radov for the radome color match the roof color. The suggestion for doing so would have been to enhance the cosmetically purpose, so as to blend the antenna into the roof.

Claims 26, 28, 38, 65, 45-56, 74, and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over TL in view of Oliver '329 and further in view of DeMarre '912 and Spano "823 and Iwamura '028.

The TL, Oliver, and DeMarre disclose the structural elements for the satellite cable ready for buildings except for the antenna having remote control for positioning and variable-inclination mechanism. Spano teaches an elevation drive mechanism is mounted on the support plate and interconnects the antenna for pivoting the antenna a predetermined angle and adjusting elevation of the antenna (see abstract). And Iwamura teaches system and method for aligning an antenna including a remote control, 15 and antenna 1 (fig. 1). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine TL, Oliver, DeMarre with Spano and Iwamura for inclination mechanism and antenna remote control The

motivation for doing so would have been to provide the antenna receiving the strong signal at any angle.

With regard to method claims 45-56, 81, TL, Oliver, DeMarre, Spano and Iwamura teach the structural elements for the satellite cable ready except for the method of assembly or installation, examiner considers this to be the obvious method of setting up the device of claims because in pre-wiring for homes, one must obviously routing wires (satellite, electrical, etc.) adjacent plurality of studs, determine all connections through out the house, enclose drywalls, connect outer termination into the antenna, cover with a radome. The TL along with Oliver, DeMarre, Spano, and Iwamura would be motivated to follow these steps to facilitate assembly to provide satellite signals for house or commercial building, etc.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/23/04 that the times of London article are highly deficient of teaching: "the satellite wires positioned adjacent to the plurality of studs and coupled to drywall layer and having first, second terminations, radome enclosing the first termination, a connector coupled to the second termination" have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because the examiner believes the prior art as a whole teach the structural elements, which have met the applicant's claimed invention. The examiner agrees with the applicant's argument that the Times of London article does not specifically disclose other aspects such as satellite wires adjacent to wall studs, a radome enclosing the first termination, etc. However, the Times of London article at least teaches the ideas of having pre-wiring to run a network of computers,

satellite and digital TV, etc. Thus that would have been well known in the art of Today's High-Tech home construction. Furthermore, the examiner combined the Times of London article with the secondary references, which specifically teach the ideas of having wires positioned adjacent to the wall studs, the radome is flat or low-profile and having color to match the roof, (see rejections above). Therefore, the examiner believes the prior art met the applicant's invention and the rejection is proper made.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Chi Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-1224, Mon-Thu (7:00-5:30), Fridays off or examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman can be reached at (703) 308-0839. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

CQN
9/30/04

Carl D. Friedman
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600